

**Meeting Description:** Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

**Date:** February 6, 2003

**Time:** 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room

I. Approval of January Meeting Minutes

II. Geographic Framework Program

A. Act 51 Reconciliation Update

Rob Surber, Center for Geographic Information (CGI), distributed a current status map of Act 51 production. Monroe and Washtenaw Counties will be done today; Macomb and Oakland Counties will be done in a couple days and Wayne County will follow. The work is being done by the county and all internal city maps are being produced now. The process is well underway.

Everett Root, CGI, stated that they are mapping the 533 cities and villages first. They will deliver those to the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to be put in the mail. There are also 3 counties in the mail. There is another half a dozen counties that need to be reviewed. There are 6 full-time staff and 4 students mapping.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that the rest of the staff will be participating when they are done with quality control and seaming.

B. Digital Ortho Update

Sherm Hollander, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), reported that they have acquired and completed processing on the western part of the Upper Peninsula. They now have full coverage of the Upper Peninsula with the 1998 color infrared series digital ortho quads (DOQs). They are working on acquiring and processing a large block in the northern part of the Lower Peninsula.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that this is all on the state's portal for access. It is in MrSID format. There will be other ways to get at them after the unveiling of the Map Michigan in the next week or so. The imagery may not be available at the time of the release – are working on getting a black and white set before the color set is available. The discussion now is looking at an image catalog as a first pass and the SDE layer as well.

C. Remote Sensing Grant Opportunity

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that there is a grant opportunity of up to \$20,000 that CGI is going to be the principal in. The goal is to have local units of government partnering with the state for use of remote sensing technology. The overall objective is to implement or replicate remote sensing applications in the local, regional, and tribal in adding their local work and also state government's. Each state in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) northeast region affiliate group that submits a request and it is approved will get a grant. There will be one project for each state. The maximum term of the project will be 10 months. CGI has to sign-off by April 30, 2003. Rob has all the information about application areas if anybody is interested in this. NASA is interested in agricultural competitiveness, air quality management, aviation safety, carbon management, coastal management, disaster preparedness, community growth, energy forecasting, Homeland Security, national invasive species, public health, water management, and conservation. Contact Rob if you are interested in a partnership. This will be up on the CGI web site.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked if their Regional 2005 flight would meet the requirements.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that the grant is for an application of the use of remote sensing. NASA is trying to apply to real world problems. This is to help jump-start this process. It has to have a direct tangible goal to applied science.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked if there is any match requirement.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that there is not.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU, commented that she received an e-mail from Jessica Moye about a grant for townships.

Justin Booth, MSU CRS, responded that it is a land use grant opportunity through the Kellogg Foundation. They are doing a split where the township can come up the half of the cost to redo land use update maps based on 1998 imagery.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that there are a certain number of slots available.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, asked if CGI has remote sensing software. There is not much of that in local government.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that they have ERDAS. CGI can talk with locals and may be able to work together. CGI's part can be minimal. The data that is available through NASA doesn't meet needs. A lot of states are grappling with this and how to bridge between real applications and data sets that are constantly coming out. NASA would like to push this to a local or regional level.

#### D. Framework Pilot Partnership Update

Everett Root, CGI, reported that the update of the Qualified Voter File (QVF) street index which is maintained at CGI (it is coordinated by Rayan Ray) for the Department of State (DOS). Rayan has set up pilot partnerships with three counties (Allegan, Branch, Barry) and 1 city (Farmington Hills). They have been submitting geographic elements (roads, streets) with the appropriate data attached to them so that CGI can update the QVF and also have an arc to indicate where the roads are so that it can be used for framework update and maintenance. Rayan and Everett presented it to Livingston County clerks. The GIS Coordinator set this up. Some of the clerks struggled with Internet connections and technology issues when they tried to update the street index. There is a lot of geographic type of information that needs to come in. The clerks are eager to work with the county GIS office.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that CGI is meeting with the DOS to initiate a large year project to reengineer the framework data model to support street index update as well as update the editor to accommodate that. Also reengineer the process of submission that local units of government use to update the framework. Now each unit of government has their own context as to what information and technology they have. Want to create technology and Internet ways to communicate map updates. Trying to create a model of sharing of information and keep it flowing from local, to county, to state, to federal. Then other state agencies can tap into it as well. The DOS is going to encourage the Clerks' Association to promote this concept. They will introduce the idea of having the Geographic Information System (GIS) office support your business. Not every community has a GIS office and not all of them are in the loop of current information. There may be cases where clerks may have to rely on other methods to get the information to CGI. One way is to get clerks to go to the organization that updates the geographic information and put CGI on their Road Update cc: list. CGI would then get the information well in advance to any voters trying to register. If a GIS office is already doing it in digital form, that conversion would already be done. Communities seem excited about getting involved. There will be different models that CGI will continue to document and share with the Census Bureau.

Gordon Rector, U.S. Census Bureau, asked if the pilot with the four areas is to test submission of information digitally. And do they do it as they have streets come on line or do they do it once a month.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, responded that they do it once a month. They get 9-1-1 once a month and updating QVF once a month is an additional 10-minute process.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, suggested that a good progression might be county first, but if they don't have anything, then the regional planning commission, and then maybe the local health department. Start with the lowest common denominator and eventually the data can be found.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that you run into politics. In most counties the clerks are elected officials and they are under the Board of Commissioners. Is the health department under the board too?

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, responded that the health department is under the Board of Commissioners and the clerks are on par with the Board of Commissioners.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, added that in the Upper Peninsula Delta Menominee Health Department and CUPPAD have digital GIS capabilities. Maybe they would be the contact for their area. Township clerks are also elected so there is a constant turnover and that will be the biggest challenge.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that the way the QVF systems works is that there are only 400+ that are actually online so counties have to serve their townships. Anything under 5,000 in population that is a township and actually has to go to the county clerk to do any business. The county is the hub for rural counties.

Everett Root, CGI, stated that in Livingston County the township clerks could not update their street index efficiently and would drive to the county courthouse and sit down with a deputy who devotes time to this.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, added that when they first started going through the process a county clerk said that at the monthly meeting the clerks said that this was overwhelming and that's when it was turned over to the GIS department.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if this was overburdening them.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, commented that she does 9-1-1 and it only takes 10 minutes more to do this.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that is the selling point to a community.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, added that the 9-1-1 processes is a lot more involved because she has to bring it up in C-map format.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, commented that all counties will be doing this any way and if they have a GIS office this is a logical extension for local application. Adding QVF submission is not a big deal.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that the key is whether the county GIS offices managing the county commissioner boundaries, school district precincts, etc.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, commented that some are and some aren't. When the clerks saw that the GIS office could redistrict the counties, the work naturally progressed. The issue with the road layer and school districts is that the boundaries can be flexible.

Rosemary Anger, Allegan County, commented that when she started the QVF process at the end of 2002 she decided that she had to go in and carve up the road segments instead of adding precinct, school district, and congressional information on to it only for the QVF update process - also wanted to incorporate into 9-1-1 so she did not have to look it up every time she did a segment. It had took a while to incorporate in the 9-1-1 systems. It took a couple of days to do. She already managed congressional districts, school districts, and zip code boundaries.

Everett Root, CGI, added that Livingston County is going to put a price tag on their data and CGI told them that if given the roads it will go into framework. And they know that framework is available free for download. The clerk and the GIS office need to work together.

#### E. Framework Editor Update

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that CGI had a meeting with ESRI. They delivered some objects to track changes in framework and attributes, and add segments in geo database. They have finished and will give to CGI who will put in an editing environment for framework. There are other challenges that CGI will have to deal with. Wayne County and SEMCOG were represented at the meeting. CGI is looking at a partnership arena to share the tools. Wayne County is interested in working versioning and deals with updates from a remote site and is able to upload those with minimal upgrade issues. That is the model CGI wants to aim for.

#### III. Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Projects and Activities

Sherm Hollander, MDNR, had nothing new to report.

#### IV. Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Projects and Activities

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that they have resurrected some of the framework tours. So that people can see where framework is at now and how they can use it, typically on web applications and business applications. The tours have generated interest among staff. As soon as they get Act 51 editing under control at Michigan State Industries (MSI), they will be working on their As Built coding to add to the framework. These are historic roadway projects from 1920s through current. They will also get in touch with Hydrology Section who wants to start some pilot projects mapping of drains. Met with SEMCOG relating to Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) and Average Daily Traffic (ADT) regarding quality issues. HPMS must be submitted to Washington on an annual basis and requires ADTs for all roads. The only ADT information available is from 1984. There were growth factors at that time. Now are looking for an easy way to plot information and easy tools to get information back from cities and counties where they have plots available. While they are doing this they may add number of lanes, paved or unpaved data and average speed limits.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that SEMCOG does that.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, added that it is in their MILAR network.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that the HPMS is the most critical. They sample the state and group by area, functional class, and what the ADT range. There is a sample accuracy of 95. If the ADT is questionable, you will not know what the competence is. Most cities and counties do some counting. Those don't probably have a good idea of traffic. In 1970s and 1984 MDOT sent out the Needs Study, which was required, and they had to fill out forms for every piece of roads. The cities and counties did not necessarily count every road, but give an average. It does effect funding and it is important to have the right tools to make it easy for the local governments to get the information to MDOT. Meetings with SEMOG have been productive. SEMCOG is also interested in air quality issues.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, asked if MDOT gets involved in speed limits.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that MDOT collects data on trunklines.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if the counters can determine speed.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, said that they can. There are speed studies that are done.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if a community request this study?

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that they can call and ask. It would have to be on state roads.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, stated it was explained to him that MDOT has new gadgets and would take readings, take the average speed, then drop the top 50% and that would be the average speed for the road.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that he presented to the Asset Management Council yesterday. The council is made up of representatives from regions, counties, road builders, MDOT. It is the new way of managing roads. The council has agreed to use framework for location referencing for

the state. The council wanted to know more about framework. The presentation went well. This brings us back to the coordinated partnership approach. Some of the people are involved in County Road Association of Michigan (CRAM). So there is a lot of relevance and momentum to the Asset Management approach to the roads in Michigan. They will be selecting a software product and a rating system in future months and give to communities who rate the roads. They will all be doing it the same way, with same standards, with the software, and with the same referencing. Then they can look at depreciation rates. Different areas of the state may deteriorate more because of more traffic or harsh winters.

Chuck Bender, Michigan State Industries (MSI), asked if there was a study done on the compositions.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that part of the software is looking at those issues. The goal in the modified depreciation approach is not to wait until it is complete, but to catch it in a critical point and improve it. Over time, you can keep the roads in reasonable condition. The studies will look at types of improvement that can be done. Terry McNinch, Michigan Tech University, does quite a bit of work with assisting local unit of governments through Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) RoadSoft product.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, said that RoadSoft's software is paid for and is free. The first task of Federal Asset Management Council will be on the federal aid roads – anything with functional class that is not on 8, 9, or 19.

Michael Hass, MSUE Branch County GIS, commented that his concern is that Branch County's Road Commission is using RoadSoft but until things are updated in framework, they have no ability to access any recent road address ranging changes made at the local level. The county GIS is routing to CGI and then it goes to the county road commission. That is a huge issue in itself.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that the data needed to go to LTAP to let them know that counties are having problems because they are not up-to-date. As soon as Version 3 is out, they will migrate to that version.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that they have been using Michigan Accident Location Inventory (MALI), which is from the early ages, for years. The key is data migration. Framework can release independent versions throughout the year and they can start seeing new roads. The key is whether there is a referencing version where they put their data so that they can find it the next year. That will be once a year. It is important to keep those in a separate place. Getting the new roads and seeing them in RoadSoft is one thing. It is an issue right now is getting RoadSoft to handle the new version. Right now they are on Version 1. CGI will continue to create new versions to the referencing.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that she thinks that a lot of packages that were written early were written under the assumption that the roadway system doesn't change, therefore there was no need to keep track of changes. MDOT's Transportation Management System (TMS) was written that way. Software was written for one referencing system and assumed that it would be stable once in place.

#### V. Michigan Department of Environment Quality (MDEQ) Projects and Activities

John Esch, MDEQ, reported their Remediation and Redevelopment Division (RRD), which is the old Environmental Response Division, works as a geologist for Super Fund Program ground work contamination. John had a whole host of issues that he presented. A layer that would help them in their division and others is 7.5-minute contour topography layer with elevation attributes. In a lot of ways it is the most fundamental layer that they need.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that he know some states have worked on this. Had a discussion at the IMAGIN Conference one time about getting that converted.

Steve Miller, MDEQ, added that it is not an unreasonable cost and U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) had made a point to cost share. Michigan has a recognized need for it throughout MDEQ, but they have never been able to tap a funding source.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that a possibility is that some of the departments could combine funding.

Rose Anger, Barry County, asked about the possibility of using Light Detection and Ranging System (LIDARS).

John Esch, MDEQ, responded that LIDARS are expensive and focused.

Rose Anger, Barry County, commented that it might be feasible for a large area.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, said that they have looked at getting the separate layer of transparent contours from USGS and raster conversion. They did some of that and there are breaks because of the labels. There is a lot of manual tagging. Dave Lusch used a method, which produced results as good or better than the 7.5-minute contours. It went by the wayside, but may be worth revisiting.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that if there is somebody championing this from the MDEQ, CGI will try to steer it through and work with somebody from MDNR. CGI would be willing to help that process.

John Esch, MDEQ, stated that it would not only benefit MDNR and MDEQ, but counties and townships.

Rose Anger, Barry County, commented that when people ask her for it she tells them she doesn't have it and nobody has it. If they want it they will have to hire an engineering company to do it.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, added that their 2-foot contours for the county is the most popular hot item. It is a moneymaker for the county. They now have surveying companies buying it from the county GIS department and adding a zero to the end of the cost and selling it.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that data conversion and data acquisition is not going to be a category that they will fund. If the state took it and did something with it, that is different.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, asked what happened when USGS was pushed on the 1-meter stuff when we said the 30-meter stuff wasn't good enough, but everybody is using it. What about a combination of stuff. If you take an existing product, 1-meter stuff using the scale of 16-foot contour max, what would it take to get below that so that we could get reasonable reliable 10-foot contours? What level of enhancement is needed using an existing product rather than starting from scratch?

Rose Anger, Barry County, added that the idea that the addition of LIDARS or the acquisition of topographic contours will be a help to National Hydrography Dataset (NHD).

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that was the initial discussion when talking to NHD was to get them.

Rose Anger, Barry County, stated that she is putting water segments in now and they may wind up being in NHD initial line segments. When she can't figure out where it is going through the forest, the topo is the first thing to come up.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that the drain commissions would love this. Rob is speaking to them at the end of the month and they may be a group to throw this out to. CGI can help steer this.

Rose Anger, Barry County, stated that even just making the ground separation layer available statewide – even if it is rasters, someone can vectorize it.

John Esch, MDEQ, added that can pull the vectors without attributes and attribute it later on. In a perfect world, vector is a shape file with the elevation attribute on there. He loves the CGI web site, but the digital raster graphics (DRGs) being mosaics (loves mosaics) – all of his sites end up being corner boards for topo maps. For a lot of district offices, county offices, and county health departments the county file is too big to download. On the old MDNR server there

is a topo map that can be download individual 7.5-minute quads. For John's use the quads are great but for most people they are not working. For the average user a small 7.5-minute TIFF files are much more flexible.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI will check into this.

John Esch, MDEQ, said there is still a need within RRD for a digital plat map.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that there is a plan in place to make digital Rockford maps available throughout state government especially as they are rectified. Each department to get access to it will have to pay a licensing fee for their department. CGI is managing the contract. CGI called all departments to see if they wanted to participate. The initial license is not bad but it is \$3-4,000 and for each additional department it is \$1,000 or a little less. Rob will take business cards of anybody who wants to be contacted. This is not a one-time deal and people can be added later. These maps will then be up on the state's server. Rockford does not do all counties. CGI is working with Cloud Cartographics and some others who do other counties. This would only be available only to state agencies that contribute to licenses.

Rose Anger, Barry County, stated that their plat book company went bankrupt and never paid the county for the maps that were produced. They owed Barry County \$3,300.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that MSU is a state university but it is a little far stretched that they would go for that.

John Esch, MDEQ, reported that NHD studies in cities, townships, and villages. Often find that the township or county have incredible data base of aerial photography, topographic contours, parcel boundaries. Every county, every township, and every city is different. It would be nice if there were a database to find the contact person and the data information.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, stated that the Kalamazoo office did that.

Rose Anger, Barry County, commented that asking the county to Metadata their own information for the state and the state will conflate on web site and tell who the contact is. But Metadata is not in the budget.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that it is more than that, for state agencies that work with counties and have a live link into the data to do the day-to-day business.

Rose Anger, Barry County, commented that maybe a link on the bottom of the data library which states the local information and the county web site. If you go to the Barry County web site, you will get maps that are better than the Rockford maps.

John Esch, MDEQ, said that he spends an hour or more with every county to find the right person. It's not the same department for every county. It would be a benefit not only to John as a MDEQ employee, but it would benefit to an engineering company that wants certain data.

Rob Surber, CGI, clarified that the action to be taken is an updated inventory for folks to be able to route right to what they need.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, added that SEMCOG has something like that.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that Dan Metzger, CGI, contacts people in an attempt to gather that information. It is conceptually exactly what is needed. CGI has been working with the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) and has found difficulty getting the Department of Agriculture for contact information.

John Esch, MDEQ, stated that CGI deals with everybody throughout the state. Even if we couldn't get a catalog could CGI provide a contact list in general, but not necessarily know every piece of data.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU, wonder if IMAGIN could publish a directory like that.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, added that IMAGIN's membership directory is on their web site.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU, added that the problem she has getting local data is that they are not use to fielding a question like this. They don't know if they should be handing out this

expensive information for free, if they are even allowed to, if it is proprietary, or if they are invading someone's privacy.

Rose Anger, Barry County, stated that she does a lot of work for the MDEQ and they come down and want the digital ortho with the parcel lines over it. And she does a lot of business for the state on their own data.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, added that the whole vertical county/state data integration is used. A number of people are actively trying to solve it.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that we have to nibble away at it. Some grandiose scheme is not going to keep a legislature's attention long enough to make an impact. The issues come down to we all have common business to perform, we all need common information to do that business, how can we sustain the information, compilation, creation, development, and integration from all sides and still maintain existence and still get the job done. CGI have attempted to create a way to provide information and who is doing what. For CGI it was beat the bushes to continue to keep people putting new information in. Maybe we need to rethink that and point them to IMAGIN's list.

Rose Anger, Barry County, added that Michigan Association of Counties is also a good web site. It gets you to all the county web sites and within the county you can find LASGIC equalization department.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that what John suggested is not a couple of steps but a way to go direct. We will have to continue to explore this. The pilot partnership in the Framework Network is designed to look at core base maps sharing issues. But it certainly doesn't cover all themes of information. CGI is trying to get a handle around a few things and that is a lot to try to deal with. CGI is looking at drains, roads, and city boundaries and certain attributes right now.

John Esch, MDEQ, stated that licensing of ESRI products, is a nightmare for them. MDEQ computer techs were transition into the Department of Information Technology (DIT) and they won't have anything to do with MDEQ any more. MDEQ found boxes of software containing licenses and upgrades that have not been doled out.

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that there was a meeting recently because DIT employees did not know what was going on. We plan to meet on that issue. The wheels are turning and CGI has gotten involved.

John Esch, MDOT, added that the governor stated that the Brownfield development is going to be a big push for her. The name of his division is Remediation and Redevelopment Division. He doesn't know if the new development will come to their division but that is part of their division's name and they are pushing for that. In other states they have web sites where you can zoom in and see public sites that are old factories or abandoned houses where the state is losing money because there are no taxes for that. That would be a great opportunity to use GIS to help the state and stop the spread of greenbelts that are happening in Livingston and Oakland Counties and get industries back into the brown belt areas. Is there an application available with all these abandoned contamination sites, which have now been deemed clean for redevelopment.

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that as CGI moves forward with services, Lynn Draschil is working with MDEQ and CGI to try and identify some project areas and Rob would be pushing them up. These are the ideas and demonstration projects that would work real well to try to create more visibility. Obviously from John's level, he knows the value that has to come from both directions. If John is going to be in the front pushing it, CGI can give some demos and present to MDEQ so that they can see what it would look like. CGI has some example applications that might not be exactly what they are looking for, but it would be close enough to present the idea.



## VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities

Eric Nischan, MSP, reported that MSP is bringing back the idea of E-Team Incident Management. It is a web based incident management software using ArcIMS to display maps of incidents. It will be a statewide system. Within 90 days it should have the e-Team implemented and be drawing on the framework base map.

Michael Hass, MSUCE Branch County, expressed a concern about Homeland Security and the currency of the data. Once again we are looking at the currency issue of framework and making sure the versioning is up-to-date.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that this flows into the concept of being up-to-date. Southeast Michigan put together meeting about Homeland Security information.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, commented that 7 counties in southeast Michigan are meeting to discuss what data they have and how to share it in case of an emergency.

Eric Nischan, MSP, said that he would like to sneak in and listen.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, said that would be fine.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that Military and Veteran Affairs has a new Homeland liaison and they are working with MSP.

Eric Nischan, MSP, commented that the Homeland Security will come together. Told Michael Hass that he could have their Homeland Security representative contact him.

Michael Hass, MSU Branch County, stated that their representative knows what they have locally do and is concerned about it. Branch County isn't a board that is going to give information away for free.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that Critical Infrastructure Protection Initiative (CPI) with Wayne County, Detroit, Windsor, Ontario project is setting up a CIPI node in the CGI office to distribute Homeland Security geographic data. A lot of software vendors will want to show their products through this as inoperable, so there will probably be an ESRI IMS application and Intergraph geo media application on site. Showing that here is the data and no matter what software you are using you can go in and share data. In case of an emergency, the state is one of the nodes – there will be state data there, Windsor data, Ontario data, etc. This will be installed in March.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked if anybody can get to the state data.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that there will be state data, local Detroit city there. We don't know who else will have access, initially it is project participants. The idea is to run the project through its course and show that the project will show all that the project wanted to demonstrate. After that they basically give the keys and leave it up to you. Then can start looking at other scenarios, other software, and other technologies. There will be an initial set-up and the data will be confined and those who will be accessing it will be based on those participants in the project. Windsor is only sharing data with the project participants at this point. They want to participant in case of an emergency but sharing data is another thing. At least we will have software and have the capability to share. The policies are sometimes the hardest issues to overcome. This project is driven by Open GIS Consortium (OGC) and they are showing technically that we can do this virtually. It sort of goes into the idea of drilling down. Start with state data and then you are on the local server pulling up local data in case of emergency so it doesn't have to managed centrally. It is a loose confederation of networks and servers.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, commented that she thinks that the meeting Tuesday will take the same direction. Everybody has data and can it be kept in one location. Thinks that SEMCOG will be asked to host the data.

## VII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Charles Bender, MSI, reported that MSI is still moving forward with ACT 51 Part 2. Just received a priority list of counties. Would like some information on the georeferencing that they did for MDNR. Particularly interested in the 3,200 lakes that MDNR was looking at having geo-referenced.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if that was for the boating application.

Charles Bender, MSI, responded MDNR wanted MSI to provide the contours, the base, and vegetation. MSI sent work for a couple of lakes that MSI geo-referenced and would like some feedback.

Rob Surber, CGI, answered that he would check on it with Laurie Prange-Gregory, CGI. She is working on the boating application with MDNR.

John Esch, MDEQ, asked if that was old MDNR metric maps that are being digitized.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that it is and they are being scanned and geo-referenced. The boating application is still being worked on. The Internet application will be unveiled in May. It will have links to that type of information. It will have links to that type of information, but digital conversion was needed.

Charles Bender, MSI, stated that it only takes them between 15- 30 minutes per each lake depending on the complexity and size.

John Esch, MDEQ, asked if it was raster or vector.

Charles Bender, MSI, responded that it depends on the information required. If they want the type of lake bottom (whether silt, sediment, gravel, sand), contour, and vegetation.

Rob Surber, CGI, added there will be a lot of information – type of fish, type of boat, and certain type of ramps. It will be an Internet application.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked if there was any plan to put the data separately in the library.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that they haven't gotten to that point yet, but that is probably what will happen.

John Esch, MDEQ, added that he is active in the Michigan Lakes Association. It is basically an association of lake associations around the state. They are really active and they would love this data.

## VIII. CGI Projects and Activities

### A. New Organizational Overview

Rob Surber, CGI, reported last time that CGI is reorganizing. Have hired the new managers for the office and have a new org chart. Everett Root is the new manager of Geo-Data Services which framework and imagery is a part of. Dave Forstat is the new manager of Agency Services – getting GIS services back to different state departments. Laurie Prange-Gregory is manager of Application Services – a lot of web applications and that is where the boating thing falls. Karen Waldrop-Ryan is manager of the Infrastructure – SDE backbone, network, and servers. The CGI director believes in personal contact with one central phone number – always being able to reach somebody rather than a voice mail. It is different than a lot of state agencies, but that is his philosophy.

## IX. MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS Projects and Activities

Justin Booth, MSU, reported that the Map Image Viewer is being ordered. Recently at the Michigan Townships Association, they got the word out that local GIS data is available for their counties. Allegan County had a presentation for a custom region for a township so they actually produced a CD for township and brought in parcels and zoning and demonstrated the availability of state data and how to get at it and implement their area. Finally got one of the emergency

management districts for MSP ready to go. The Map Image Viewer bundled the 6 county set, so it is a custom cut region for the first emergency management district. There are some Health Departments who have begun working with it – Kalamazoo, Central Health District, and Ingham. MSU has a few more layers to add to the Viewer. The next project that they will work on with CGI is DOQQ mosaicing in ER Mapper creating the compressed ECW images. Displayed a status map of which mosaics are created for the state. MSU has been working with raw data images from MDNR and Natural Resources Conversation Service (NRCS) to get them into their image archive and getting them on hard drive and backed up for availability at the image archive in the basement. They have all the 1992s and the 1998s and they continue to build that up. CGI has this data on their hard drive. People are asking for clipped custom regions for different areas. Ducks Unlimited is helping MSU find areas where there are problems and areas where data was lost in the balancing and mosaicing through ER Mapper. MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS was recognized by ER Mapper for the work that they are doing and MSU is on ER Mapper's web site – link to web page at MSU for the mosaicing for the statewide DRGs, the topo mosaic that is online, also the Land Satellite from NASA (LANDSAT), and Ingham County mosaic. Hopefully there will be a statewide mosaic as well. They are working with CGI and getting into SDE with the new routing application.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, asked if this would be in the Spatial Data Library.

Justin Booth, MSU, said that the problem with that is that it would get out to people in its large size.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that the plan is to some time have it there. The problem is that with the state firewall CGI must have 2 copies of everything - those for internal use what and those for external use.

Justin Booth, MSU, stated that the Eaton County file was close to 400 megabytes. Just did one for Ottawa and Kent that was close to 700 megabytes. The ER Mapper site has all the necessary plug-ins to get into ArcGIS. An easy way to get it is to order a county through the Map Image Viewer for a cost of \$25. MSU is thinking that they will probably distribute it by DVD or CD at distribution cost. It is not bad if you have a good web connection.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, added that he downloaded 500 MB in less than an hour on the FTP at home. It would be helpful if this is in two versions.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, stated that they sent theirs to Western Michigan University for them to stitch together and bring the townships into TIFs with state plane. Works by township and if she needs something on the township line, can bring up plot. There are up to 9 separate sheets for one township.

#### X. County / Local Projects and Activities

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, got a call from 9-1-1 from a secretary who had gotten a cell phone with a GPS locator on it. They tested it by standing in the front yard of emergency dispatch and gave Rosemary a series of coordinates and wanted to see what it came up as. Rosemary punched in the coordinates, got the picture of dispatch and a 3-mile region. It was not on the map. The secretary thought it might be the receiver. Rosemary went 2 miles to the receiver and punched in the coordinates and it wasn't there either. Rosemary zoomed out and it was 5 miles in the middle of a swamp. This was an experiment.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated he had talked with Ron Vibbert, MDOT, and the MDOT staff is looking at cell phones and GPS units and assigning them to staff and getting coordinates while they are out there and talking on the phone.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated if they are 5 miles off, they don't want it.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, added that the On Star system is real successful. There were vehicles that were stolen from Kent County and driven into Barry County and On Star located

them. 9-1-1 is not necessarily ready for coordinates that On Star puts out, but can tell them where they are based on the coordinates that On Star gives them.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, reported that they had a Michigan Counties GIS meeting and trying to force the issues on vertical state integration. Hope to hit the membership with a draft version of what they are trying to do. Rob Surber, CGI, had good suggestions as to what kind of endorsements they should look for to get the attention of people higher up. By this summer Allegan County will have a new office with 1000% increase in space. It will be real nice.

#### XI. Regional Projects and Activities

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, had a status map of their 2000 land use update from '95. They are still shooting for their June goal of having this done. They are still attributing the 2000 census block attributes on the framework. Livingston and St. Clair Counties are done and they are doing one last check to minor civil division (MCD) boundaries. Macomb, Oakland, Monroe, and Washtenaw Counties are in the finalization stage and Wayne County is 60% done. They plan to have it done by the end of the calendar year. Asked Everett Root, CGI, if he got the bridge data she had sent to him.

Everett Root, CGI, said that he did and forwarded it on to Dennis Kenaga.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, brought fliers for the IMAGIN Conference Student Paper Competition. The deadline for the competing student abstracts is March 15.

Abbi Mueller, WMRPC, reported that she is working with the Fair Housing Center in Grand Rapids on a Section 8 Project making maps for a presentation using the Center specific Grand Rapids framework.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that she could touch base with any presentations CGI can help with.

#### XII. Federal Projects and Activities

Gordon Rector, U.S. Bureau of the Census, reported that their headquarters started feeding Harris Corp. Tiger line files to do repositioning. Two Michigan files, Livingston and Monroe, were the first one for that effort.

Everett Root, CGI, contacted with them yesterday and got an update.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, said that they hope that later this summer we will see the product. Nobody at this meeting probably uses it any more.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, commented that SEMCOG is using it for the 2000 blocks.

Rob Surber, CGI, asked if there is any transfer of attributes.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, responded that there is but it is a secondary thing.

Rob Surber, CGI, was wondering if on intersection identifications if CGI placed common linkages for future.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, commented that he would find out about it.

#### XIII. Other Issues

#### XIV. Next Meeting Date

March 6, 2003, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, Lansing, MI 48913